

REMARKS

I. Formal Matters.

Claims 3-6, 11 and 13-16 are currently pending in this application. As a preliminary matter, Applicant thanks the Examiner for considering the references submitted via Information Disclosure Statements on November 10, 2004, and March 14, 2005, as evidenced by the return of initialled copies of Forms PTO-1449 and PTO/SB/08 A&B, respectively, to the office of the undersigned.

II. Claims.

Claims 1-17 are rejected as allegedly being obvious over *Lhotak* (U.S. Patent No. 5,671,345) in view of *Tokiwa* (JP 09-198217) under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

Claims 1, 7, 10 and 17.

Claims 1, 7, 10 and 17 recite that the display data includes template data which is subjected to the editing. Further, at least a type and a position of the template are capable of being edited. Applicant submits that the cited references fail to teach or suggest the above feature. *Lhotak* discloses a method and system for intercepting low level device dependent information from a graphics management interpreter for reconstructing the low level device dependent information into high level object oriented data for each object on a given page. The *Tokiwa* reference is merely directed to color correction. Thus, even if combined, Applicant submits that *Lhotak* and *Tokiwa* fail to teach or suggest the features recited above.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 1, 7, 10 and 17.

Claims 2 and 12.

Since claims 2 and 12 are dependent upon claims 1 and 10, respectively, Applicant submits that such claims are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

Claim 3.

Claim 3 is hereby presented in independent form, incorporating the subject matter of claim 1. The Examiner relies on secondary reference *Tokiwa* to provide the step of editing the display data uses only the added-value, posteriorly added, information (OA page 4). *Tokiwa* at page 5, paragraph [0030], discloses "...image forming part 28 generates image data [from converted printed data]..." Further, "[i]mage forming part 28 also has a function of adding *a later...image* to the printed image [data]" (*Tokiwa* page 5, paragraph [0030]). Finally, "[t]he image data output from...part 28 are...supplied to the color correction part 22...[and] the image data are supplied to the [display] CRT 30..." (*Tokiwa* page 5, paragraph [0030]). Color correction is taught as "...the designation of color correction may be performed to one or plural objects, [where]...user moves...a frame [via a mouse] encircling a desired object..." (*Tokiwa* pages 7-8, paragraph [0034]).

In contrast, present claim 3 requires “....said step of editing the display data *uses only* the added value information which is being displayed...” Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claim 3 on the grounds that *Lhotak* and *Tokiwa* fail to teach or suggest editing display data, using only the posteriorly added information. In fact, *Tokiwa* teaches away from the subject matter of claim 3, teaching “designation of color correction may be performed to one or plural objects”, where both printed image data and later printed image data are displayed (*Tokiwa* page 5, paragraph [0030]; and page 7, paragraph [0034]).

Claims 4, 5, 6, 8 and 9.

Since claims 4, 5 and 6 are dependent upon one of claims 3 or 7, Applicant submits that such claims are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

Claim 11.

The Examiner applies “*Lhotak*”, but cites to secondary reference *Tokiwa* at page 10, paragraph [0038], to provide “wherein said data edit process is a process *of detecting an object added* to the print data and editing contents of the object on the basis of an instruction” (OA page 7). *Tokiwa* at page 10, paragraph [0038], teaches different color correction methods. *Tokiwa* teaches a user selecting the object to be color corrected, and selecting the color correction scheme or method (*Tokiwa* pages 7-8, paragraph [0034]); page 10, paragraph [0038].

In contrast, present claim 11 requires “wherein said data edit process is a process entering an editing instruction, *detecting an object added* to the print data, and editing contents of the added object on the basis of the editing instruction.” Neither primary reference *Lhotak*, nor secondary reference *Tokiwa*, teaches or suggests providing an editing instruction to be applied to subsequently detected added objects. Claim 11 has been rewritten in independent form, and Applicant asserts patentability therefor relying upon the deficiency of *Lhotak* and *Tokiwa* described above.

Claim 13

Claim 13 contains subject matter of similar to that recited in claim 3. Therefore, claim 13 has been rewritten in independent form, and Applicant argues for the patentability thereof on the grounds presented above for claim 3.

Claims 14, 15 and 16

Since claims 14, 15 and 16 are dependent upon claim 13, Applicant submits that such claims are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

III. Conclusion

In view of the preceding amendments and remarks, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue that the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephonic interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the local telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees (except the Issue/Publication Fees) to our Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Allison M. Tulino
PTO Reg. No. 48,294

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: July 13, 2005